



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,031	01/20/2004	Thomas J. Wheeler	0275S-468COA	3122
27572 7590 12/14/2007 HARNESSE, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			EXAMINER PRONE, JASON D	
			ART UNIT 3724	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/14/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/761,031	WHEELER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason Prone	3724	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,9-11 and 16-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-8 and 12-15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 January 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                   |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application         |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Appendix A &amp; B</u> . |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to because in Figure 1, it is unclear what items "70" both occurrences, and "72" are pointing at. The reference lines from one of the "70"s and "72" appear to be in dotted form and are extremely light. These lines should be a continuous line darker than the one provided. Also, one of the "70"s should be deleted. In Figure 5D, item "26" is clearly not pointing at the 2<sup>nd</sup> portion, if anything it is pointing at the 1<sup>st</sup> portion. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "42" and "60" have both been used to designate base/floor. It is noted that the floor and the base are the same structure. Either the term base 42 should be replaced with floor 60 or vice versa. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "124" has been used to designate both grooves in paragraph [0029] and an output gear in paragraph [0032]. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: on line 1 of paragraph [0028], item "78". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities: on the 3<sup>rd</sup> to last line, the phrase "said interface edge" should be replaced with "said interface". Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention. The terms "a clamp" and "a cam" along with the limitation "said cam member spaced from said clamp such that said cam member functions independently of said clamp" is unclear. Using Figure 3, it appears that cam system 28 incorporates the clamp 38. Figure 3 clearly shows that the cam and clamp are part of the same structure. A linking phrase should be included that links these two structures together (i.e. the clamp is part of the cam member). Figure 3 clearly shows that the clamp is part of the cam, therefore, how can the cam be spaced from the clamp and how can the two structures function independently when they are one in the same?

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claim 20 is rejected, as best understood, under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schickerling (6,112,420).

Schickerling discloses the same invention including a housing containing a motor (Field of the Invention), a saw blade having a shank portion (24) and a cutting portion (20), a carrier having a first portion adapted to receive the blade (60) and a second portion (32), the first portion including a pair of side walls (40, 42) and a base portion extending in-between (44), a clamp extending from the side walls and operable to engage the blade at an interface (26, 60) to retain the shank portion of the blade within the first portion (58), a cam member fixed between the side walls (102), the cam



member positioned from said base portion forming a channel to receive the blade (Fig. 5), the cam member being juxtaposed to a portion of the blade the interface and the cutting portion (Fig. 7), and the cam member is spaced from the clamp such that the cam member functions independently of the clamp (Fig. 6).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright (6,694,625). Please see Appendix A for examiner added reference numerals.

Wright discloses the invention including a housing (36) containing a motor (24), a substantially flat planar monolithic one piece carrier slidably disposed within the housing (2), the carrier including a first portion (800) with a planar base (801) and side walls extending from and continuous with the planar base defining a channel adapted to receive a blade (802, Fig. 5), a second portion continuous with the first portion forming a one piece carrier (803), the second portion having a slot (804) with lateral side walls extending from opposing edges of the slot forming an opening through the carrier (805, 806), the carrier positioned in the housing such that a plane of the base is in a line of cutting with the saw blade so that the plane of the line of cutting is substantially parallel to the plane of the planar base (Fig. 5), a rotatable element fixed for rotation about a support and rotated by the motor (30), a follower for interconnecting the carrier and the

rotatable element (32), and wherein rotation of the rotatable element provides reciprocal linear motion of the carrier whereby the follower follows a reciprocal linear path within the lateral walls (Fig. 11).

However, Wright fails to disclose the follower rolls on the lateral walls.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have tried/experimented with a follower that rolls instead of slides along the walls of the slot. By using a follower that will roll rather than slide would allow for all sides of the follower to wear equally instead of just allowing the two sliding points to wear by themselves. Therefore, it would have been an obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the follower of Wright to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1. The claim would have been obvious because a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product is not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense.

12. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Neubert et al. (5,398,414). Please see Appendix B for examiner added reference numerals to Neubert et al. Wright discloses the invention but fails to disclose a releasably attached base portion, the base portion including a first pair of lateral rails for slidably engaging a second pair of lateral walls incorporated on the housing, and the base includes a latch for selectively coupling the base to the housing.

Neubert et al. teach it is old and well known in the art of saws to incorporate a releasably attached base portion (17), the base portion including a first pair of lateral



rails (23a, 23b) for slidably engaging a second pair of lateral walls incorporated on the housing (13a and it is clear from the Figure 1 that the housing is split into two halves and the second of the pair of lateral walls would be the portion opposite 13a), and the base includes a latch for selectively coupling the base to the housing (24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Wright with a releasable base, as taught by Neubert et al., because all claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective function and the combination would have yielded predictable results.

13. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright. Please see Appendix A for examiner added reference numerals.

Wright discloses the invention including a housing (36) containing a motor (24), a saw blade having a cutting edge, a mounting edge, and a side surface (12), the side surface defining a first plane in a line of cut with the cutting edge (Fig. 5), a monolithic one piece carrier (2) including a first portion (800) defining a channel adapted to receive a blade (802, Fig. 5), the channel including a base defining a second plane (801) and walls extending from and continuous with the base and substantially perpendicular to the second plane (8), the first plane is parallel to the second plane and the first plane is resting on the second plane (Fig. 5), a second portion continuous with the first portion forming a one piece carrier (803), the second portion having a slot (804) with lateral side walls extending from opposing edges of the slot forming an opening through the carrier defining a path (805, 806), a rotatable element rotated by an output shaft extending

from the motor (30), a follower for interconnecting the second portion and the rotatable element (32), and wherein rotation of the rotatable element provides reciprocal linear motion of the carrier whereby the follower follows a reciprocal linear path within the guide path (Fig. 11).

However, Wright fails to disclose the follower rolls on the lateral walls.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have tried/experimented with a follower that rolls instead of slides along the walls of the slot. By using a follower that will roll rather than slide would allow for all sides of the follower to wear equally instead of just allowing the two sliding points to wear by themselves. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the follower of Wright to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11. The claim would have been obvious because a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product is not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense.

14. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Zeiter et al. (6,920,695) Wright discloses the invention but fails to disclose a fan.

Zeiter et al. teach it is old and well known in the art of saws to incorporate a fan (30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Wright with a fan, as taught by Zeiter et al., because all claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have

combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective function and the combination would have yielded predictable results.

15. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Zeiter et al. as applied to claims 11 and 16 above, and further in view of Wild (5,199,174). Wright in view of Zeiter et al. disclose the invention but fail to disclose vents associated with the fan.

Wild teaches it is old and well known in the art of saws to incorporate vents associated with the fan (15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Wright in view of Zeiter et al. with vents, as taught by Wild, because all claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective function and the combination would have yielded predictable results.

16. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Neubert et al. Please see Appendix B for examiner added reference numerals to Neubert et al. Wright discloses the invention but fails to disclose a releasably attached base portion, the base portion including a first pair of lateral rails for slidably engaging a second pair of lateral walls incorporated on the housing, and the base includes a latch for selectively coupling the base to the housing.

Neubert et al. teach it is old and well known in the art of saws to incorporate a releasably attached base portion (17), the base portion including a first pair of lateral rails (23a, 23b) for slidably engaging a second pair of lateral walls incorporated on the

housing (13a and it is clear from the Figure 1 that the housing is split into two halves and the second of the pair of lateral walls would be the portion opposite 13a on the other half of the housing), and the base includes a latch for selectively coupling the base to the housing (24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Wright with a releasable base, as taught by Neubert et al., because all claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective function and the combination would have yielded predictable results.

17. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neubert et al. in view of Wright. Please see Appendix B for examiner added reference numerals to Neubert et al. Neubert et al. disclose the invention including a housing containing a motor (14), a first pair of lateral rails integrally formed on and extending from the housing (13a and it is clear from the Figure 1 that the housing is split into two halves and the second of the pair of lateral walls would be the portion opposite 13a on the other half of the housing), a releasably attached base portion (17), the base portion having a second pair of lateral rails extending from the base portion (23a, 23b) the second pair of rails slidably engaging the first pair of rails (Fig. 2), the base having a latch for selectively releasably coupling the base to the housing in a locked position (24), the latch for providing a quick release of the base from the housing (24), the latch is biased into an engaged position against a stop extending from the base (24), and the latch is movable between the engaged and disengaged position (24).

However, Neubert et al. remain silent and therefore fail to disclose a drive mechanism coupled to the motor and a carrier disposed within the housing and operable to interconnect a blade to the drive mechanism for translating rotational movement of the motor into linear actuation of the blade.

Wright teaches it is old and well known in the art of saws to incorporate a drive mechanism coupled to the motor (30) and a carrier disposed within the housing and operable to interconnect a blade to the drive mechanism for translating rotational movement of the motor into linear actuation of the blade (4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Neubert et al. with a drive mechanism and carrier, as taught by Wright, because all claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective function and the combination would have yielded predictable results.

### ***Response to Arguments***

18. Applicant's arguments filed 15 august 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regards to the rejection of claim 20, item 102 is perfectly capable of functioning in some manner independently of 58. The claim does not disclose what function the cam does independently of the clamp. Figure 6 clearly shows a function being performed by item 102 independently from the clamp 58.

19. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-19, and 21-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

20. Claims 3-8 and 12-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Conclusion***

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Wheeler et al. ('389) and Wheeler et al. ('698).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Prone whose telephone number is (571) 272-4513. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30, Mon - (every other) Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer D. Ashley can be reached on (571) 272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

December 10, 2007



Application/Control Number:  
10/761,031  
Art Unit: 3724


Page 14

Patent Examiner  
Jason Prone  
Art Unit 3724  
T.C. 3700

*Jason Prone*

Patent Examiner  
Jason Prone  
Art Unit 3724  
T.C. 3700

Appendix A



## **Appendix B**

